

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5-9 and 12-25 are pending in this application. Claims 8, 9, 17, 18, 19, 21 and 22 have been amended. Claims 1 and 5-7 have been canceled without prejudice. New claims 26-31 have been added. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication that claims 1, 5-7 and 21-25 are allowed. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication that claim 18 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C § 102

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,720,580).

It is respectfully submitted that Kim does not disclose or suggest "the reflecting plate has a first edge extended into a second area", as recited in amended claim 17. In an exemplary embodiment of the present application, the reflecting plate (160) has a first edge (L1) extended into a second area (145). *See, e.g.*, Figs. 1 and 2 of the present application. In contrast, Kim discloses a reflecting plate (27) that has no edge portion extended into the second area (29). *See e.g.*, Fig. 3B of Kim. This aspect can be further clarified from the top view (Fig. 3A) of Kim reference showing the boundary the reflecting plate (27) and the second area (29). The top view (Fig. 3A) shows that the reflective plate (27) has no edge portion extended into the second area (29). Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 17 is not anticipated by Kim.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claim 17 under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) and claim 17 is in condition for allowance.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C § 103

Claims 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kim et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,720,580) in view of Baek et al. (U.S. 20020036730).

As provided above, Kim does not disclose or suggest that the reflecting plate has a first edge extended into the second area, as claimed in claim 17. Baek does not cure the deficiency of Kim in this regard. Claim 19 depends from claim 17. Accordingly, the dependent claim 19 is allowable due to its dependency on claim 17.

Therefore, applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 be withdrawn.

Claims 8, 9, 12, and 14-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto et al. (U.S.20030067570) in view of Baek et al. (U.S. 20020036730).

The Office Action acknowledges that “Okamoto does not disclose color filters corresponding to the reflecting portions have a larger thickness than the transmission region color filter”. Applicants believe that the Examiner intended to state that “Okamoto does not disclose color filters corresponding to the reflecting portion have a smaller thickness than the transmission region color filter”. For this element, the Office Action relies on Baek.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that there is no suggestion or motivation to combine Okamoto with Baek. Indeed, Okamoto teaches away from their combination. In Okamoto, the substantial portion on the substrate (62) corresponding to the reflection display section (9) does not have a color filter. *See e.g.*, Fig. 27 of Okamoto. Okamoto states that “This is because the reflection display section cannot attain sufficient brightness if it uses the color filters entirely, and the brightness is compensated by providing therein a portion where the color filters are not used.” *See e.g.*, paragraph [0455] of Okamoto. As such, Okamoto discourages forming color filters in an area corresponding to the reflecting area. Therefore, there is no motivation to modify Okamoto to include color filters having a smaller thickness in the first area as claimed.

Accordingly, the Examiner’s reliance on the combination of Okamoto and Baek to support the rejection under section 103 is misplaced and the rejection of claim 8 is legally deficient.

Claims 9, 12, and 14-16 depend from claim 8. The dependent claims are allowable due to its dependency on claim 8.

Therefore, applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 be withdrawn.

Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kim et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,720,580) and Baek et al. (U.S.20020036730) and in view of Auman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,856,432).

Kim does not disclose or suggest “the reflecting plate has a first edge extended into the second area”, as essentially recited in amended claim 17. Neither Baek nor Auman cures the deficiency of Kim in this regard.

Claim 20 depends from claim 17. The dependent claim is allowable due to its dependency on claim 17.

Therefore, applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 be withdrawn.

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as unpatentable over Okamoto and Baek in view of Ha et al.

Claim 13 depends from claim 8. The dependent claim is allowable due to its dependency on claim 8.

Therefore, applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 be withdrawn.

For the foregoing reasons, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner's early and favorable action is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned if he has any questions or comments in this matter.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael F. Morano
Reg. No. 44,952
Jaewoo Park
Ltd. Rec. No. L0302
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

F. Chau & Associates, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
TEL: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889